

REMARKS

Claims 16, 76, and 79-88 were pending at the time of the last Office Action. Applicant has amended claims 16, and 76 and canceled claim 86. Thus, claims 16, 76, 79-85, 87, and 88 are now pending.

The Examiner has objected to claims 16 and 76. The Examiner believes that the claims recursively recite "comments for each comment." The claims actually recite "comments and for each comment, an identification...." Nevertheless, applicant has amended these claims to help clarify them.

The Examiner has rejected the claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as outlined in the following table:

Claims	References
16 and 76	Stettner, McAnaney, and Baryla
79 and 84	Stettner, McAnaney, Baryla, and Braitberg
80 and 85	Stettner, McAnaney, Baryla, and Srinivasan
81	Stettner, McAnaney, Baryla, and Hofberg
82	Stettner, McAnaney, Baryla, and Okuno
83	Stettner, McAnaney, Baryla, and Skillen
86	Stettner, McAnaney, Baryla, Srinivasan, and Hofberg
87	Stettner, McAnaney, Baryla, Srinivasan, Hofberg, and Okuno
88	Stettner, McAnaney, Baryla, Srinivasan, Hofberg, Okuno, and Skillen

Although applicant disagrees, applicant has amended the claims to clarify the claimed subject matter.

Stettner describes an interactive television show in which viewers can submit questions and be notified of when their questions or questions of others will be answered during the television show. There is, of course, only one broadcast of the interactive television show and different viewers can decide to view some portions and not view other portions. For example, a viewer could submit a question and not view any other portions of the television show until that question is being answered.

Applicant has amended each independent claim to make clear that the second viewers are viewing a recorded version of a television show or video. Independent claims 16 and 76 recite “rendering portions of a television program (or video) that was previously recorded.” Stettner only addresses live broadcasts.

Applicant has also amended each independent claim to recite “rendering to the second viewer the selected portions of the recorded version of television program (or video) as a rendering that is separate from the renderings for other second viewers.” As discussed above, Stettner only has one broadcast and simply notifies the viewers of the time when answers of interest will be broadcast.

Applicant has also amended independent claim 16 to make it clear that the rendering includes “only the selected portions.” Stettner, in contrast, has only one rendering that includes all of the live broadcast and not only the portions that are of interest to a viewer. Thus, even though the viewer may close their eyes during a portion that is not of interest, Stettner still renders the entire broadcast.

Based upon the above amendments and remarks, applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of this application and its early allowance. If the Examiner has any questions or believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is encouraged to call the undersigned at (206) 359-8548.

Please charge any deficiency in fees or credit any overpayment to our Deposit Account No. 50-0665, under Order No. 418268854US from which the undersigned is authorized to draw.

Dated: January 15, 2010

Respectfully submitted,

By Maurice J. Pirio
Maurice J. Pirio

Registration No.: 33,273
PERKINS COIE LLP
P.O. Box 1247
Seattle, Washington 98111-1247
(206) 359-8548
(206) 359-9000 (Fax)
Attorney for Applicant